

REMARKS

Claims 1–8, 11, 15–63, 72–75 and 77–83 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 5, 16, 17, 19, 22, 29 and 59 are amended; claims 9, 10, 12–14, 64–71 and 76 are canceled; claims 11, 15, 18, 32, 36, 38, 40, 42, 45, 48, 51, 53–58, 63, 72, 73 and 75 are amended and withdrawn from consideration; claims 80–83 are added and claims 2, 6–8, 20, 21, 23–28, 30, 31, 33–35, 37, 39, 41, 43, 44, 46, 47, 49, 50, 52, 60–62, 74 and 77–79 are withdrawn from consideration. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found, for example, in paragraphs [0025]–[0028] and page 6, lines 10–22. No new matter is added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and prompt allowance in view of at least the following remarks.

The Office Action objects to claims 5, 12, 13, 14, 16, 22, 29 and 69 for containing informalities. The claims are amended to correct the objected to language by replacing "other digital camera" with "another digital camera," as suggested by the Office Action. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 22 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,774,935 (Morimoto). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Morimoto fails to disclose "wherein when the judgment device judges that the detection result of the second detector was first detected prior to the detection result of the first detector, in the event that the first digital camera is instructed by the second digital camera when the first digital camera performs the normal camera operation, the first digital camera stores the instruction and makes it a rule to execute the instruction from the second digital camera after completion of the normal camera operation," as recited in claim 1. Rather, the Office Action merely alleges that Morimoto discloses a master camera mode and a slave camera mode and using a plurality of operating devices (250) to select the mode

(Office Action at page 7). The Office Action alleges that the controller discussed in Morimoto controls a first camera set to the slave mode if a second camera chooses the master camera mode first (Office Action at page 7). The Office Action further alleges that the discussion of the various modes in Morimoto discloses the "judgment device that judges" and a "controller that controls" (Office Action at page 7). However, Morimoto does not discuss that "the first digital camera stores the instruction and makes it a rule to execute the instruction from the second digital camera after completion of the normal camera operation," as recited in claim 1, because Morimoto is silent in this respect to the alleged judgment unit. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Morimoto for at least the above reason.

As claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1, claims 3 and 4 are patentable, as least in view of the patentability of claim 1, as well as for the additional features claims 3 and 4 recite.

Further, Morimoto fails to disclose "wherein the display device of the master digital camera is turned on and the display device of the slave digital camera is turned off in a collaborating work mode," as recited in claims 22 and 29. Morimoto discloses that, "as shown in Figs. 13C and 13 D, when the UP switch 6 of the master camera 1 is depressed, the images of both cameras are forwarded as if the UP switch of the slave camera 1' were depressed. However, in this mode, the LCD display 10 of the master camera 1 displays the same image as that displayed on the LCD display of the slave camera 1'" (Morimoto at col. 8, lines 56–62). Thus, Morimoto clearly fails to disclose that "the display device of the master digital camera is turned on and the display device of the slave digital camera is turned off in a collaborating work mode," as recited in claims 22 and 29, because it discloses that both the master and slave displays are on. Accordingly, claims 22 and 29 are patentable over Morimoto for at least the above reason.

Based on the foregoing, and because claims 9 and 10 are canceled, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the above rejection.

The Office Action rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,864,911 (Zhang). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Zhang fails to disclose "wherein the digital camera further includes a camera judgment device that judges a type of the other digital camera and the setting instructor sends out to the other digital camera a compensation value corresponding to the given item or the given value based upon a judgment result of the camera judgment device," as recited in claim 5. Rather, Zhang discusses that the two digital cameras used to link together to form a stereo image must "be compatible with each other for the purpose of capturing stereo images" (Zhang at col. 4, lines 51–53). Zhang further discusses that the cameras can be identical cameras or they can be different camera models as long as the focal length and lens speed of the cameras are as identical as possible (Zhang at col. 4, lines 53–55). Although Zhang discusses using different cameras, Zhang fails to disclose "a camera judgment device that judges a type of the other digital camera and the setting instructor sends out to the other digital camera a compensation value corresponding to the given item or the given value based upon a judgment result of the camera judgment device," as recited in claim 5. Therefore, claim 5 is patentable over Zhang for at least the above reason. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

The Office Action rejects claims 16, 17, 19, 59 and 64–68 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0011683 (Yamasaki). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Yamasaki fails to disclose "wherein the display device of the master digital camera is turned on and the display device of the slave digital camera is turned off in a collaborating work mode," as recited in claim 16. Rather, Yamasaki discloses that when the cameras are connected by the connection cable 3, both displays on the camera display the various, selected information, as disclosed in, for example, Fig. 19. Because Yamasaki discloses that the

displays of both cameras operate to display information while the cameras are connected, Yamasaki does not disclose "wherein the display device of the master digital camera is turned on and the display device of the slave digital camera is turned off in a collaborating work mode," as recited in claim 16.

Further, Yamasaki fails to disclose "a folder name creator that creates a folder name of a first image data storing folder, according to a first camera information about the digital camera and a second camera information about the other digital camera, to differentiate a first image data which is output from the image element or from the other digital camera in the collaborating shooting and a second image data in normal shooting which is output by the image element; and a controller creates a first image data storing folder which is named the folder name in the storage medium, stores both the first image data which is output from the image element and the first image data which is output from the other digital camera in collaborating shooting, and stores only the second image data which is output from the image element in normal shooting," as recited in claim 59.

Yamasaki discloses storing images in an existing folder or creating a new folder (Yamasaki at paragraphs [0064]–[0069], [0076] and [0077]). When the user selects creating a new folder, the user enters a folder name and the image is stored in the newly created folder (Yamasaki at paragraph [0077]). When the user selects to store an image in an existing folder, the image is stored in a folder that was previously created under the above method (Yamasaki at paragraph [0076]). Yamasaki discloses that the folders have certain data related to them, such as the address where the folder data is stored, a folder name, protection status, and information that indicates that the folder data or folder itself is a folder icon (Yamasaki at paragraph [0093]). However, Yamasaki does not disclose that the folders contain "first camera information about the digital camera and a second camera information about the other digital camera" and "a controller creates a first image data storing folder which is named the

folder name in the storage medium, stores both the first image data which is output from the image element and the first image data which is output from the other digital camera in collaborating shooting, and stores only the second image data which is output from the image element in normal shooting," as recited in claim 59. Therefore, claim 59 is patentable over Yamasaki for at least the reasons discussed above.

As claims 17 and 19 depend from claim 16 and claims 80–83 depend from claim 59, the dependent claims are patentable, at least in view of the patentability of claims 16 and 59, as well as for the additional features the dependent claims recite. Accordingly, in view of the above and the cancellation of claims 64–68, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

The Office Action rejects claim 76 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,188,431 (Oie); rejects claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Morimoto in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,106,364 (Noro); rejects claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Morimoto in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0201688 (Wolf); and rejects claims 69–71 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0071912 (Minakuti) in view of Morimoto. These rejections are moot in view of the cancellation of the rejected claims.

Applicants respectfully request rejoinder of the withdrawn claims. At least claims 2, 6–8, 18, 20, 21, 23–28, 30, 31 and 60–62 depend or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable claim. Therefore, the requirements for rejoinder are satisfied. *See* M.P.E. §821.04.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

Jesse O. Collier
Registration No. 53,839

MAC:KRG/jnm

Attachment:
Extension of Time

Date: September 19, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--